UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/467,310	12/17/1999	ROBERT J. CHANSLER	07844-280001	2224

21876   7590   07/08/2003

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
500 ARGUELLO STREET
SUITE 500
REDWOOD CITY, CA 94063

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, NHON D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	3

DATE MAILED: 07/08/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>*17 December 1999*</u> .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-35* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-35* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority. documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .   6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

   The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 7, 11-20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

   Claim 7 recites the limitation "the map" in line 7. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

   Claim 12 recites the limitation "the associated function and appearance" in line 17. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

3. Claim 35 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

   Claim 35 refers "the device is a telephone", but claim 32 declares "a device couple to the processor to present the user interface". A telephone cannot present a user interface.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by
another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted
on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant
for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall
have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the
international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such
treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Rangarajan et al ("Rangarajan", US 6,275,225).

As per independent claim 1, Rangarajan teaches a method of defining a user

interface for a computer program, comprising:

after execution of the computer program has begun (*Start 201* of fig. 2; col. 5, line

8), defining a user interface of the program (col. 5, lines 56-58) by:

reading a function description of a first function to be provided by the user

interface (col. 7, lines 8-14, and *605* and *607* of fig. 6);

reading an appearance description of a first appearance to be presented by the user

interface (col. 7, lines 30-61);

associating the function description and the appearance description on the fly at

run time; and executing the user interface with the associated function and appearance

(*215* of fig. 2).

As per claims 2, which is dependent on claim 1, it is inherent in Rangarajan's

system to replace the function description during program execution.

As per claims 3, which is dependent on claim 1, it is inherent in Rangarajan's system to replace the appearance description during program execution.

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Rangarajan teaches:

reading a map defining multiple functions to be provided by the user interface including the first function (fig. 8; col. 9, lines 22-27);

reading a fashion defining all appearances to be presented by the user interface including the first appearance (fig. 8; col. 9, lines 28-34);

associating the map and the function on the fly at run time; and executing the user interface with the associated map and function (col. 9, lines 49-52).

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, it is inherent in Rangarajan's system to replace the map during program execution.

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, it is inherent in Rangarajan's system to replace the fashion during program execution.

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Rangarajan teaches the map specifies that a subordinate part of the user interface is specified by a second map-fashion pair (fig. 8; col. 9, lines 22-27).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Rangarajan teaches receiving events from the map component or the fashion component (col. 8, lines 27-29).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 8, Rangarajan teaches comprising executing business logic associated with the respective component (col. 8, lines 29-33).

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 1, it is inherent in Rangarajan's system that the components are stored in a database.

As per independent claim 11, Rangarajan teaches a method of defining a user interface for a computer program, comprising:

associating a map component and a fashion component on the fly at run time to generate the user interface; and executing the user interface with the associated function and appearance (fig. 8; col. 9, lines 22-34 and col. 9, lines 49-52).

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 11, Rangarajan teaches loading a resource bundle associated with the map component (fig. 8; col. 9, lines 22-27).

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 12, Rangarajan teaches locating sub-components of the user interface (fig. 8; col. 9, lines 28-34).

As per claim 14, which is dependent on claim 12, Rangarajan teaches further comprising instantiating one or more sub components of the user interface (fig. 8; col. 9, lines 28-34).

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 12, Rangarajan teaches calling the fashion component to allocate a resource to each sub-component (fig. 8; col. 9, lines 28-34).

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 15, Rangarajan teaches instructing each sub-component to present itself in the user-interface (col. 9, lines 49-52 and fig. 9; col. 9, lines 59-67 through col. 10, lines 1-13).

As per claims 17 and 18, which are all dependent on claim 11, they are rejected under the same rationale as claim 8.

As per claim 19, which is dependent on claim 11, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 9. ·

As per claim 20, which is dependent on claim 11, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 10.

As per independent claim 21, it is a similar scope to claim 1; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claim 22, which is dependent on claim 21, it is a similar scope to claim 2; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claim 23, which is dependent on claim 21, it is a similar scope to claim 3; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claim 24, which is dependent on claim 21, it is a similar scope to claim 4; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claim 25, which is dependent on claim 21, it is a similar scope to claim 5; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claim 26, which is dependent on claim 21, it is a similar scope to claim 6; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claim 27, which is dependent on claim 21, it is a similar scope to claim 7; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claim 28, which is dependent on claim 21, it is a similar scope to claim 8; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claim 29, which is dependent on claim 28, it is a similar scope to claim 9; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claim 30, which is dependent on claim 21, it is a similar scope to claim 10; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per independent claims 31 and 32, they are similar in scope to claim 2; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claim 33, which is dependent on claim 32, Rangarajan teaches the device is a display (*111* of fig. 1).

As per claim 34, which is dependent on claim 32, it is inherent in Rangarajan's computer system (fig. 1) to have a sound input-output device.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 6342907 B1 to Petty, Douglas Robert et al. discloses specification language for defining user interface panels that are platform-independent.

US 6100885 A to Donnelly, Vanessa et al. discloses supporting modification of properties via a computer system's user interface.

US 5600780 A to Hiraga, Rumi et al. discloses programming environment system for customizing a program application based upon user input.

Inquiries

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-8318. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8 AM to 5:30 PM with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kistine L Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Nhon (Gary) Nguyen
June 27, 2003